DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 187 SO 019 886

AUTHOR Butts, R. Freeman
TITLE Democratic Values: What the Schools Should Teach.
PUB DATE 7 Oct 88
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on the Future of Civic Education (Washington, DC, October 5-7, 1988). For related documents, see SO 019 562, SO 019 887 and SO 019 895-898.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizen Participation; *Citizenship; *Citizenship Education; Citizenship Responsibility; *Civics; Civil Liberties; Democracy; *Democratic Values; Due Process; Elementary Secondary Education; Justice; Patriotism; Privacy; *Role of Education; Social Studies; Social Values
IDENTIFIERS Authority; Bill of Rights; Diversity (Groups); Equality (Social); Freedom; Truth; United States Constitution

ABSTRACT

If students are to fulfill their obligations and rights as U.S. citizens they must develop the ability to make careful judgements, based on a reasoned historical perspective and a meaningful conception of the basic democratic values underlying citizenship in our constitutional order. To this end, an agenda of 12 core civic values that are fundamental to the theory and practice of democratic citzenship in the United States has been devised. Called "The Twelve Tables of Civism," this agenda includes six obligations of citizenship: justice, equality, authority, participation, truth, and patriotism and six rights of citizenship: freedom, diversity, privacy, due process, property, and human rights. An in-depth discussion of each of these values, their place in the U.S. political system, and the nature of both their true and corrupted forms is given. Schools have an unparalleled opportunity to influence an entire generation of high school youth during the coming years, especially during the Constitution's bicentennial celebration. The National Competition on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, sponsored by the U.S. Bicentennial Commission and the Center for Civic Education, is one such opportunity to invigorate the civic life of schools. Project "Civitas," conducted by the Center for Civic Education and the Council for the Advancement of Citizenship, has also been initiated, and is designed to draw up and disseminate an exemplary civic education curriculum. Twenty-three references and a list of thirteen selected readings are included. (PPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307187

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DEMOCRATIC VALUES:

WHAT THE SCHOOLS SHOULD TEACH

by

R. Freeman Butts

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. FREEMAN BUTTS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper prepared for a National Conference
on the Future of Civic Education
entitled
"Citizenship for the 21st Century"
Washington, DC - October 5 - 7, 1988

Sponsored by the Foundation for Teaching Economics
and the Constitutional Rights Foundation

SO 019 886

****

Portions of this paper have been adapted from the final chapters of my two books, one recently published and one forthcoming: The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century, (Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education, 1988); and The Civic Mission of Educational Reform: Perspectives for the Public and the Profession, (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1989).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Democratic Values

The purpose of this paper is to outline briefly the democratic ideas and values that I believe should be explicitly studied and practiced throughout the American school system. Nothing is more common than for curriculum guidelines to proclaim the teaching of democratic values as a major goal of public education in general and of social studies in particular, but then to fail to make such values explicit or clearly visible in the content or scope and sequence of topics they recommend for study.

Even the influential social studies frameworks recently drawn up in New York and California, which argue that democratic values should be continuing themes throughout secondary education, both skip a beat by not requiring civics at the 9th grade.[1] They postpone the specific study of government to the 11th or 12th grades. This missing link is potentially a disaster. So long as the drop-out rate is so high, many youth will never get to the serious study of democratic values.

There is a second missing link. Those textbooks designed for the civics courses that <u>are</u> taught in the 9th grade pay little attention to democratic values. An excellent example is the review of five civics texts and 13 government texts carried out by a six-member panel of political scientists and teachers, chaired by James D. Carroll of the Brookings Institution and including the former executive director of the American Political Science Association and Norman J. Ornstein, research scholar at the Heritage Foundation. Their conclusion was that

> ...the texts put too much stress on facts and too little on concepts, methods, and participation. As a result, the

texts too often are static descriptions of dynamic processes, ignoring questions of belief and value at the heart of people's "lives and fortunes and sacred honor."[2]

James Carroll summarized the panel's recommendations as follows:

> In general, we face the challenge of developing a fresh approach to the subject of government, one that brings it to life and induces the student to think critically about American public values, the conflicts among them, and the difficulty and necessity of continually making choices...
>
> 1. The overall approach to teaching government in high schools should be changed from merely imparting information to more broadly preparing students to become concerned, active citizens.
>
> 2. The Constitution, and particularly the Bill of Rights, should be examined early in the text and used throughout as a context for discussion. Greater emphasis should be placed upon constitutional values through the use of case studies, profiles of individuals, and significant Supreme Court cases.
>
> 3. Controversial issues should be discussed fairly and explicitly.
>
> 4. Students will learn the necessity and value of involvement by becoming involved...Students should be able to "practice" some aspects of responsible citizenship and observe firsthand the workings of politics and government.[3]

In my two recent books I have been arguing for substantially the same points, namely, that the public schools should give highest priority to substantive teaching and learning of the civic values underlying the ideals and practices of democratic citizenship. I do not couch these values in terms of imperatives that imply only one correct answer or set of beliefs. Instead, I have phrased them in commonly used words and ideas of political discourse, which students and teachers together should study and try to understand, if they are to fulfill their obligations and rights as American citizens.

How are citizens to be prepared to judge the merits of public policies in domestic and foreign affairs as conducted by officials now in office or as proposed by candidates for office? How are citizens to be enabled to judge the tangled web of one kind of morality in public talk and another kind of ethics in personal practice, whether found in government, the stock market, or corporate, labor, or religious enterprises? Surely not by any simple formulas of moral or civic preachments. In the long run this can best be achieved only by careful judgments informed by a reasoned historical perspective and by a meaningful conception of the basic democratic values underlying citizenship in our constitutional order.

A striking example of the need for such informed judgment was the way the appeal to the pledge of allegiance was handled in the 1988 presidential campaign. The candidates and the public alike failed the test over and over again. The pledge was simply bandied about as a symbol of patriotism or the lack of it. The role that the state and the public schools should properly play in promoting civic loyalty, patriotism, and commitment to democratic values was scarcely hinted at. (See the following section on Patriotism, pp.

26-32) The occasion for a constructive civics lesson was all but lost.

The time is ripe for American education to pay more attention to how much agreement there may now be about the civic values that schools and colleges should transmit through serious study and practice. No one expects full agreement or uniform acceptance of beliefs. I would hope, however, that there might be greater agreement about what is worth studying and learning.

To this end, I offer a possible agenda in "The Twelve Tables of Civism," with my apologies to the decemvirs of the Roman Republic who presumably drew up the original "Laws of the Twelve Tables" for the early Roman Republic and to Aristotle's paradigm of politics in the later Greek republics. The "Twelve Tables" were the earliest codification of customary Roman civil and criminal law in the fifth century B.C. Aristotle posited that the true forms of government (monarchy, aristocracy, and republic), which served the public good, became corruptions when the rulers served their own interests and the king became a tyrant, the aristocracy an oligarchy, and the republic a democracy or mobocracy.

Why twelve? Because that is a parsimonious number of concepts with which to summarize the underlying principles and values of American citizenship that should be studied in school and college. Besides, they are fewer than the Maryland Values Education Commission's 19 character and citizenship values, or Edward Wynne's list of 21 values in Character II; and they are only slightly more than Chester Finn's 10 values of cultural conservatism, but well under the 4,500 items of knowledge that E.D. Hirsch, Jr., proposes for cultural literacy.[4]

Why tables? Because a "table" is a schema or arrangement of words (or numbers) to exhibit a set of facts or ideas in a definite, compact, or

comprehensive form. The tabular form, especially in parallel columns, may enhance the teaching effectiveness of the concepts by emphasizing the counterpoints between Unum and Pluribus, between the obligations of citizenship that bind us together as a political community and the rights of citizenship that betoken a democratic polity.

Why civism? Civism is a perfectly good English word, defined in the Oxford, Webster, and Random House unabridged dictionaries simply as "the principles of good citizenship." Despite its unfamiliarity in present usage, it echoes the late eighteenth-century era of democratic revolution when it was coined in French as "civisme," taken in turn from the Latin civis, meaning a citizen. Originally, it implied a favorable disposition toward the new French Republic, but since the English were not particularly favorably disposed toward the French Revolution, they used the term to refer especially to the citizenship ideals of the ancient Greek and Roman republics and to the citizen principle in general. The Latin word civitas has also come into the English language (see Webster's third edition and Random House's second), meaning the body of citizens constituting a politically organized community as well as the idea of citizenship itself, especially as imparting shared responsibility, a common purpose and sense of community. The term civism is a shorthand way of referring to the principles, sentiments, and virtues of good citizenship in a democratic republic.

So I offer the concepts suggested in Table I as an agenda for revitalizing civic education in American schools and colleges, a common core of civic values that are fundamental to the theory and practice of democratic citizenship in the United States. Whatever religious sanctions

or ethical principles may give them support, they are the civic imperatives for American schools.

Justice

The basic idea of justice (that which is fair) is pervasive in most social contacts and at most ages. But there is also a timely educational reason for starting with the concept of justice. The past two decades have witnessed a remarkable shift of interest in political philosophy as well as in public affairs to questions of morality, equality, authority, and the obligations of citizenship along with matters of freedom and rights of citizenship. The idea of justice embraces all of these. It is a subject where several disciplines intersect: history, political science, philosophy, law, and religion as well as economics. The idea of justice or fairness is thus a good starting point for study and discussion in civics courses.

It is useful to think of justice as the moral basis of a democratic society, what John Rawls, Harvard philosopher, calls the "first virtue of social institutions." It is what must govern the conduct of people in their relations to one another, if the society is to be self-sufficient and well-ordered. Rawls speaks of a public sense of justice that produces a society in which everyone accepts, and knows that others accept, the same principles of justice. This means that the members of a well-ordered society must develop strong moral sentiments and effective desires to act as the principles of justice require.

The public sense of justice establishes the claims of what is right as prior to the claims of what is good since what is good is defined differently by individuals and groups according to their particular life-styles and personal desires. The principles of what is right and what is

TABLE I

TWELVE TABLES OF CIVISM FOR THE MODERN AMERICAN REPUBLIC*

(with apologies to the "Laws of the Twelve Tables"
of the Early Roman Republic and to
Aristotle's Paradigm of the Later Greek Republics)

UNUM The Obligations of Citizenship		PLURIBUS The Rights of Citizenship	
Corrupted Forms of Unum	True Forms of Unum	True Forms of Pluribus	Corrupted Forms of Pluribus
"Law and order"	Justice	Freedom	Anarchy
Enforced sameness; conformity	Equality	Diversity	"Unstable pluralism"
Authoritarianism; totalitarianism	Authority	Privacy	Privatism; privatization
"Majoritarianism"	Participation	Due process	"Soft on criminals"
"Beguiling half-truth; plausible falsehood"	Truth	Property	"Property rights superior to human rights"
Chauvinism; xenophobia	Patriotism	Human rights	"Cultural imperialism"

Democratic Civism

* Adapted from R. Freeman Butts, The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century, (Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education, 1988), p. 136. ©

just thus put limits on what may seem to be reasonable conceptions of one's own good. A just social system defines the boundaries within which individuals and pluralistic communities may develop their aims and actions. Rawls' first principle of justice is the citizen principle:

> Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all.[5]

What are the "equal liberties" of citizenship? They bear close resemblance to the American constitutional order guaranteed by the Bill of Rights:

> The basic liberties of citizens are, roughly speaking, political liberty (the right to vote and to be eligible for public office) together with freedom of speech and assembly; liberty of conscience and freedom of thought; freedom of the person along with the right to hold (personal) property; and freedom from arbitrary arrest and seizure as defined by the concept of the rule of law. These liberties are all required to be equal by the first principle, since citizens of a just society are to have the same basic rights.[6]

Rawls' position has been criticized by some philosophers and social scientists, but his thinking points unmistakably to the priority of achieving a common civic community based on the citizen principle of justice, which I regard as the prime authority for the purposes of public education in general and of civics teaching in particular. He has paved the way for philosophers and practitioners of education to restore a profound

civic, moral, and political basis to public education, if they but will.

Our task is to try to find out if there are common agreements on what values should be studied in civic education, agreements among academic specialists who may differ among themselves on fine or major points of political philosophy. For example, Michael Walzer of the Institute for Advanced Study attacks many aspects of Rawls' position, but he also says that teachers committed to the basic discipline necessary for democratic politics will try to establish a shared knowledge among their students. He says:

> The aim is not to repress differences but rather to postpone them, so that children learn to be citizens first — workers, managers, merchants, and professionals only afterward. Everyone studies the subjects that citizens need to know.[7]

Freedom

What is most illuminating about Rawls' theory of justice is his assignment of first priority to the idea of equal basic liberties. The just political community will then be committed to the idea of freedom as well as equality. I view freedom as having at least three elements relevant to civic education. Freedom involves:

(a) the right, the opportunity, and the ability of every human being to live his or her own life in dignity and security and to seek self-fulfillment and self-realization as a person or as a member of a chosen group without arbitrary constraint by others. This is the freedom of the person and of private action.

(b) the right, the opportunity, and the ability of every human being to speak, to read, to inquire, to think, to believe, to express, to learn, and to teach without arbitrary constraint or coercion by others, especially as a means for making deliberate choices among real alternatives on the basis of reason and valid and reliable knowledge. This is the freedom of the mind and of intellectual inquiry.

(c) the right, the opportunity, and the ability of every citizen to take active part in shaping the institutions and laws under which he or she lives in common with others and to do this by making uncoerced choices and by participating through active consent in cooperation with one's fellow citizens; and to do so in such a way as to promote justice, freedom, and equality for others. This is the freedom of the citizen and of public action.

Just as we need a "public conception of justice" as the basis for a well-ordered society, so do we need a "public conception of freedom" that is held sufficiently in common to assure the vitality of a free and democratic political community. Without some guidelines, the cherished freedoms can lead to the corruptions of anarchy, license, or unbridled libertarian individualism, as Aristotle and subsequent advocates of a high ideal of citizenship so often feared.

Equality

Along with justice and freedom, the idea of equality runs throughout the American creed of value claims for a democratic political community. "All men are created equal" is the first of the self-evident truths of the

Declaration of Independence. It even comes before the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The idea of equality was a counterpoise in the eighteenth-century struggle for democracy against the tyrannies of privilege and the closed orders of aristocracy and hierarchy. But it is also true that ever since, there has been an almost constant discord between the claims of freedom and the claims of equality.

There have been deep conflicts over the meaning of equality. Basically, does the phrase "all men are created equal" mean that in fact they are equal, or that they should be treated as though they are equal? Americans have generally put their emphasis on equal rights and equal opportunity rather than on enforcing an equality of condition or income, which may become a corruption of the democratic ideal of equality.

As the First Amendment was the charter for freedom, so the Fourteenth Amendment became the charter for equality. But it was not until the 1950's and 1960's that it became clear to the civil rights movement that stronger — not weaker — government would be required to achieve equal protection of the laws to overcome the historic discriminations that had resulted when states and local communities practiced "freedom of choice" by allowing dominant local groups to impose their views on their institutions and schools. The Supreme Court ruled in 1954 in Brown v. Board of Education that the constitutional command of the national political community on behalf of equality must override the freedom of lesser political communities to institute segregational practices. This persistent tension between equality and freedom should be faced in civic education programs as directly and as honestly as possible.

Diversity

Respect for diversity and encouragement of a plurality of communities have been among the best elements of the American political system. Millions of immigrants have been and still are attracted to the United States because of their hope for life in a society that provided greater justice, freedom, and equality than they knew in their homelands — and they hoped for greater economic advantage as well. And millions found their hopes at least partially realized in a country of enormously diverse geography, ethnicity, language, religion, race, and culture.

So, diversity or plurality is one of the major values to be studied, analyzed, and honored in any program of civic education in American schools. This becomes all the more important today as the arrival of large numbers of people from Latin America, South Asia, and other countries leads to heightened controversies about bilingual education and to efforts to make English the official language.

There is merit in views that attempt to arrive at a balanced tension between the values of cultural plurality and political cohesion. For example, historian John Higham distinguishes between ethnic boundaries that strive to keep people in or out of groups and ethnic nuclei that give identity and sustenance to different groups:

> No ethnic group under these terms can have the support of the general community in strengthening its boundaries. All boundaries are understood to be permeable. Ethnic nuclei, on the other hand, are respected as enduring centers of social action...[8]

The major point of my stress upon civism is exactly to rediscover what political values we have in common as well as redefining the values of plurality. Another view with merit is a distinction posed by Michael Kammen, Cornell historian. He distinguishes between "stable pluralism" and "unstable pluralism." An unstable pluralism occurs when the cleavages in society threaten the very authority of the polity because of the conflict among racial, ethnic, religious, or regional groups, each of which forms its own political party and has its "own faction, each sect its own school, and each dogmatist his own ideology." On the other hand:

> Stable pluralism requires a strong underpinning of legitimacy. A plural society is best insured by the rule of law -- law made within the framework of an explicit constitution by elected representatives, executed by a partially autonomous administrative staff, and adjudicated by an independent judiciary...
>
> But stable pluralism in a democracy also requires a strong and lasting inventory of psychological legitimacy: understanding, acceptance, and pervasive confidence in the composite system necessary to make it run smoothly rather than by fits and starts.[9]

The building of a "strong and lasting inventory of psychological legitimacy" is one perceptive way to define the purpose of civic education for the schools in a democracy, in which a plurality of racial, ethnic, and religious communities is acknowledged and even welcomed. One need only note the stark contrast between the United States with all its pluralist problems and countries where unstable pluralism either prevents a psychological

legitimacy toward government at all (as in Lebanon) or periodically threatens the stability of the polity (as in India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Nigeria, Ghana, Uganda, Northern Ireland, or Spain.)

Authority

The role of authority can usefully be illustrated for students at all age levels, ranging from the need for rules on taking turns in the kindergarten to the need for laws on stealing, assault, murder, and treason. At the heart of political authority is the difference between sheer power and legitimate or rightful authority. Power is usually considered to be the ability to exercise control over people or conditions to direct their conduct or influence the outcome of an event desired by those in positions of power. The most common examples of sheer power to control events are military force and money.

On the other hand, power becomes legitimate authority when recognized as such and sanctioned by custom, institutions, law, constitution, or morality. Authority in a democratic polity is thus the exercise of influence and command by those in positions of power when done so within the confines of rules made by the consent of the governed and considered over a period of time as legitimate.

The right of an official to make decisions, determine policies, and maintain order derives not from the official's private capacity, but by virtue of a right conferred by society. So the exercise of democratic political authority ideally should be under the constraint of the values of fundamental justice and fairness as well as functioning to ensure the greatest amount of freedom and equal opportunity for the individual under rules of due process and with a fair distribution of privileges and

resources in the society. Failing these constraints, authority is corrupted into authoritarianism or totalitarianism. Without authority, freedom degenerates into license or anarchy, pluralism becomes unstable, and individuals can be assured of little privacy or due process.

Leonard Krieger, university professor of history at Chicago, points out that there was another meaning of authority that originated in Rome, a meaning not so much associated with sheer power as with an uncoercive authority associated with persons or knowledge whose trustworthiness and responsibility are a warrant or guarantee that their deliberate judgments, convictions, and decisions are worth following as models or examples.[10] An auctor in Latin is a trustworthy writer, a responsible person, a teacher, a guarantor, a model whose ideas and judgments are worth following.

It is this latter sense of authority as trustworthiness that has been so eroded in recent years. Students have revolted against the authority of schools and colleges, against the authority of government officials, against the authority of parents, churches, business, and other institutions that in the past have claimed the right to guide the conduct and behavior of the young. But it is noteworthy that the concept of authority in relation to citizenship has become a matter for serious scholarly study in recent years. I think particularly of the faculty seminars on "Ethical Issues: Citizenship and Political Education" supported by grants from NEH to the American Political Science Association directed by Richard Flathman of Johns Hopkins and J. Roland Pennock of Swarthmore.[11] Especially pertinent here is the recent book Democratic Education, by Amy Gutmann, professor of politics at Princeton. She locates the authority for cultivating "common democratic values among all children" (in private as well as public schools) in the

democratic ideal itself, which she elaborates persuasively in her book.[12] Critical study of such academic fare on authority and citizenship, which is fundamental and necessary but too often is not applied to the theory or practice of civic education, would enable the profession to think of authority as more than orderliness and obedience in the "effective" classroom.

Privacy

Privacy is one of the basic pluralist values of a democratic political community along with freedom, diversity, and due process. I distinguish it from the privatism or excessive privatization of public services (including education), which I view as a corruption of privacy. As freedom includes the right to live one's life in dignity and to seek one's self-development and self-fulfillment, so privacy is the right of individuals and groups to be left alone and to determine for themselves what information about themselves or their actions is communicated to others.

Infringement of this right was one of the most irritating of the eighteenth-century practices that led to the Third Amendment's guarantees against the quartering of troops in private households and to the Fourth Amendment's guarantees that the people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures. The revelations of the spying activities of the CIA and FBI on American citizens during the Vietnam War and the campus unrest, the Watergate tapes, and much else have led to new concerns about the protection of privacy. The development of electronic devices has added a 1984 quality to all kinds of business activities (such as computers that keep credit ratings on millions of consumers) as well as those of government agencies.

But the right of privacy has moved much beyond matters of information about a person that should be kept private from government or technological surveillance. While the word "privacy" does not appear in the Constitution or Bill of Rights (just as "education" does not), the right of privacy has been brought by the Supreme Court under the heading of freedom in the First Amendment, of liberty in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments as well as under the Fourth Amendment's protection of the person against search and seizure. The most controversial of these issues in the public eye have had to do with such intimate associations as sexual relations, abortion, and homosexuality.

Although questions of the rights of privacy of students in elementary and secondary schools may once have seemed rather far removed from such constitutional questions, the demands for "teaching values and morality" have proliferated with the rise in juvenile pregnancy and drug abuse among teenagers. And inevitably, the issues of privacy versus authority and moral values versus academic excellence have spilled over in the schools. For example, the celebrated case of New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) arose when a vice principal in Piscataway High School searched a student's handbag suspecting that she had been smoking in the girls' lavatory, but found evidence of possible use and sale of marijuana. Were her rights to privacy under the Fourth Amendment's protection against search and seizure superior to the authority of school officials to uphold school rules and laws against use and sale of drugs? In a 6-3 decision, the Supreme Court affirmed a middle course. It ruled that school officials are not acting in place of parents (in loco parentis) and thus they do not have all the rights that parents have to control and discipline their children. But it also affirmed

that school officials must have "reasonable grounds" for believing that their search of lockers and handbags or persons would provide evidence of breaking the rules or the law. Students thus do have some, but not complete, constitutional rights to privacy, while teachers, not being parents, do have the obligation to apply the Fourth Amendment's protection protection of privacy to students and thus are in effect "officers of the Constitution."

Due Process

While privacy concentrates on a citizen's being left alone, due process has to do with the rights of persons who have been accused of wrongs or injuries they have allegedly committed. Due process values center on the Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Amendments with their presumption of innocence and their provisions for protection of individual rights in criminal cases and civil suits at law. Of special interest to educators has been the development in recent years of the concepts of due process as applied specifically to teachers, students, and parents.

The drive to achieve more protection of due process for children's private rights in the juvenile justice system was directed at students in schools as well as out-of-school youth. The key case here was Goss v. Lopez, which involved nine high school students in Columbus, Ohio, who were suspended during racial demonstrations and unrest in 1971 for up to ten days without a hearing, as permitted under Ohio law. The students charged that the law was unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment because it deprived them without due process of their property (their right to attend school) and of their liberty (by injuring their reputation without a hearing). In January, 1975, the Supreme Court declared in a five to four

decision the law to be unconstitutional and ruled that students in high school were to be granted due process in suspensions. This must include oral or written notice of the charges of misconduct, an explanation of the charges and the evidence against them, and an opportunity to give their side of the story before suspension from school.

The due process rights of children and students could be a subject of study that would quickly enlist the interest of students. Teachers and officials of public schools have now been put on notice that they must be concerned for the due process rights of children as well as their own. They need to be as clear as possible about the relative allocation of authority and responsibility among the parents, the child, and the state whose officers they are. It is now clear that children, as well as adults, have constitutional rights and that the state may not be too intrusive into the parent-child relationship. But the state also has the obligation to protect children, when necessary for the child's welfare, even against the parents if they neglect or abuse the child. Children do not have all the due process rights that adults have, but they do have more than they did before Goss.

Property

The purpose of including property rights in a table of civism is not to suggest that students or teachers must take law courses on property or contracts, but rather to recognize the concept of property and private ownership as a basic element in the forming of the American republic and to know some of the fundamental changes that have taken place during the past two hundred years. The emphasis here is not on a course in economics, or free enterprise, or comparative economic systems. Instead, the emphasis is

on the rights and responsibilities of ownership of property in a democratic society, the relationship to ownership of individuals, groups, and the state with regard to matters of justice, freedom, equality, authority, privacy, and due process. Rudimentary concepts of "what's mine," "what's yours," and rules about acquiring, using, transferring, and disposing of tangible properties can be developed in early years of schooling, as the materials developed by Law in a Free Society have shown. Rules against stealing, damaging, destroying the property of others and how arguments should be settled, equity achieved, and by whose authority play a large part in early schooling. The inclusion of intangible property (such as ideas, benefits, entitlements, or labor) along with tangible property then leads to further consideration of the rights and responsibilities regarding property, the scope and limits of ownership, and other major subjects of legislative and judicial concern.

It is clear that most of the founders believed that property and liberty went hand in hand. The federal Constitution was designed at least in part to free people and property from intrusion by the state governments. Kenneth M. Holland, political scientist at the University of Vermont, describes the new meaning of property increasingly defined under the welfare state to include social benefits and entitlements (including education). He refers to a formative article in 1964 by Charles A. Reich who argues that welfare benefits are no longer a charity or government largess, but a new kind of property embracing rights that cannot be withdrawn or withheld without due process of law.[13] There is, of course, much controversy and debate over such broadening of the conception of property rights, whether justified on grounds of due process, privacy, equality, civil liberties, or

justice. All the more reason for students and teachers alike to study these issues along with the other tables of civism. All the better to judge how far we have come from the compromise of the Constitution that regarded slaves as three-fifths of a person and the Dred Scott decision where slaves were viewed as non-persons and as tangible, exchangeable property belonging to another, the ultimate corruption of property rights.

Participation

The idea of participation has undergone a great deal of modification since the Declaration of Independence asserted that the just powers of government derive from "the consent of the governed" and since the preamble of the Constitution proclaimed that "We, the people" are sovereign. Much of the original notion of popular consent and of sovereignty of the people rested on the idea that citizens would participate directly in the making of laws and indeed in the making of the fundamental contract known as the Constitution. But the idea of citizen participation had to change from the days of a Greek polis, with its few thousand citizens, or a New England town meeting with its few hundred citizens. Debates over the meaning of democracy as direct participation by the entire body of citizens, contrasted to a republic, meaning participation through selecting representatives to make decisions, has continued from the Constitutional Convention and the Federalist Papers down to the present time.

The idea of participation as a key value in a democratic political community should be studied and debated by students and teachers along with the practice of participatory experience as illustrated in the citizen-participation movement in general and its counterpart in community action programs for students in schools. In addition to political campaigning,

voting, and lobbying, "participation" of a more direct and active sort has become increasingly important since the decade of the 1960's. After all, sit-ins, marches, freedom rides, and civil disobedience were a critical part of the practice of participation in the civil rights movement. Draft-card burnings, demonstrations and disruptions on college campuses highlighted "participatory democracy" when it became a by-word of the New Left movements of the 1960's and 1970's. The justification, costs, and benefits of these forms of a more direct participation movement along with those being advanced by thoughtful political scholars should be the subject of careful study and analysis in school civics.

But there is another model of participation that its advocates argue is more appropriate for the conditions of a modern technological society, where issues are so complicated that direct decisions by the masses of citizens cannot be the rule. Rather, it is argued, a representative model of participation should be revitalized to take better account of the expertise of professionals who, along with elected officials, are held accountable by the public. In the mid-1970's, a good example of this model, along with criticism of direct participation reforms, was given by the late Stephen K. Bailey, political scientist in education and social policy at Harvard.[14]

These arguments should be considered along with the revitalizing of the movement to increase direct involvement of citizens and to increase the effectiveness of direct participation. A growing body of scholarly underpinning for this trend has begun to replace Bailey's undisguised contempt for the "romantic half-truths" of the starry-eyed reformers of the 1960's and the early 1970's. One of the most persuasive of the more recent reformers is Benjamin R. Barber, political scientist at Rutgers, whose

Strong Democracy has received wide attention. He argues that representative democracy is scarcely democracy at all and that a strong form of participatory democracy of genuine self-government is not only compatible with the Constitution but with the conditions of modern technological society.[15]

Truth

If we accept freedom of access to knowledge as the very basis of a democratic society, then the reliability and the validity of public knowledge become of primary importance. The search for truth becomes one of the major goals of democracy. Therefore, respect for truth should begin with the young child, the parent, and the teacher as they try to distinguish the "small fib" and the "white lie," which, while doing little harm to others, may become the "big lie," that may do irreparable harm to others. Then we come to the distinction between a falsification that arises from ignorance, partial knowledge, or mistake and a falsification deliberately undertaken with the intention to cover up one's own actions, to control the actions or beliefs of others, or to do actual harm to others. Thus, the laws against perjury and libel incorporate into the polity the moral sense that truth is better than lying and that deliberate untruths are punishable for the sake of the common good and public welfare. The study and practice of truth-telling become mandates for civic learning at every stage of education for citizenship, not confined to the courtroom stage of "telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

In this complex and confusing arena of where, how, and why the truth should be told or not told, I can only hint at those aspects deserving careful study. One has to do with the rights and responsibilities of

citizens in seeking or telling the truth about one another, but even more important is the role of government in revealing or hiding the truth from its citizens. A vast literature has accumulated, especially since World War II, documenting the ways in which totalitarian nations, both Communist and Fascist, and military dictatorships of virtually every hue have enforced controls over the flow of information and use of falsification and lying when it served the purposes of those in control. Deliberately deceiving the public is the essence of a closed society; every coup is immediately accompanied by closing down newspapers and taking over radio and television stations. We have learned to expect the strangling of truth by dictatorships of the Left and the Right.

Even more troublesome and alarming is the mounting concern about lack of truth-telling by the governments of democratic and free societies. Major examples in the United States stem from deceptions about Vietnam emanating from the government under Lyndon Johnson, the attempted cover-ups of Watergate under Richard Nixon, and the drawn-out investigations about who did and who did not tell the truth about Nicaragua and Iran in 1986 and 1987 under the Reagan administration. When trust in the veracity of the presidency and of major government officials declines, the foundations of a free society are at risk. Citizens who cannot distinguish between significant truth and plausible falsehoods, beguiling half-truths, or outright lies cannot retain their freedom. Nor can a government that lies to its citizens continue to serve justice and equality, maintain its legitimate authority, or even expect loyalty from its citizens.

Patriotism

This is one of the most difficult of the cohesive values to make clear and persuasive to American students and teachers in the light of the traumatic events of the past two decades. Our predecessors from the time of the American Revolution spoke of the individual's obligation for the public good in terms of civic virtue, patriotism, and loyalty to the new emerging nation as well as duty, discipline, and obedience to moral and religious commands. These were powerful sanctions for civic education programs for generations, but they have been weakened in the past fifty years. The military defense of the nation as a reasonable form of civic obligation probably reached its peak in World War II, when a vast majority of the American people genuinely believed that defense against Nazi and Fascist aggression and the inhuman persecution of minorities justified a moral war. But the Korean War seemed less immediately critical to the safety and security of the United States; and the Vietnam experience convinced large numbers that it was an immoral war and thus not justified as a reasonable cause for patriotism or military service.

A sense of obligation and responsibility manifested by loyalty, patriotism, discipline, and duty is still needed as a social and political glue if the structure of the democratic polity is to persist, let alone thrive. The schools, of course, cannot alone instill values of personal obligation and responsibility if other major social institutions are preaching and practicing advancement of self and private interests, an argument so persuasively advanced by Robert Bellah and his colleagues. But this is no reason for the schools not to try, by reassessing what they <u>can</u> do and by seeking the aid of all community and public groups committed to

the value claims of the democratic polity.

This was the basic question of substance that neither candidate discussed in the 1988 election. George Bush simply said that he thought it was appropriate for a state legislature to require public school teachers to lead their pupils in the daily pledge of allegiance to the flag (as the Massachusetts legislature had done in 1977). By imputation he charged that Governor Michael Dukakis was weak on patriotism by vetoing the bill. Dukakis at first simply replied that he had followed an advisory opinion of the Massachusetts Supreme Court that the law was unconstitutional; and then later replied that he resented the implication that he lacked patriotism by the act of vetoing the bill.

The commentators of press and TV quickly chose up sides, and a few tried to educate the public on the underlying constitutional issues, but the public had not learned the relevant civics lessons in their schooling and they were not hearing it from the candidates. Why not use the authority of the state to require students and teachers to salute and pledge allegiance to the flag? The answers to that question cover a full century of conflict and controversy.

The pledge was first devised as a promotional scheme for Youth's Companion in 1892 in celebration of the 400th anniversary of Columbus's discovery of America. In the patriotic fervor of the Spanish-American War, some of the states and many local school boards began to require the pledge as part of the regular opening exercises of the schools. Fraternal and patriotic organizations favored compulsion; civil liberties and some religious groups opposed, especially the Jehovah's Witnesses who claimed that the compulsory salute to the flag was in effect a worship of an image

forbidden to them by the religious teaching of the Bible.

The heightened patriotic fervor of World War I and the approach of World War II led to bitter and even violent attacks upon the Witnesses whose children were expelled from schools for refusing to take part. The Witnesses began to take their case to court in the 1930's resulting in two remarkable decisions.

In Minersville v. Gobitis (1940) the issue was clearly and eloquently drawn in an 8-1 decision.[16] Writing for the majority, Justice Felix Frankfurter stated:

> A grave responsibility confronts this Court whenever in course of litigation it must reconcile claims of liberty and authority. But when the liberty invoked is the liberty of conscience, and the authority is authority to safeguard the nation's fellowship, judicial conscience is put to its severest test. Of such a nature is the present controversy.

After balancing these "two rights in order to prevent either from destroying the other," Justice Frankfurter came down on the side of political cohesion:

> The ultimate foundation of a free society is the binding tie of cohesive sentiment. Such a sentiment is fostered by all those agencies of the mind and spirit which may serve to gather up the traditions of a people, transmit them from generation to generation, and thereby create that continuity of a treasured common life which constitutes a civilization...
>
> A society which is dedicated to the preservation of these ultimate values of a civilization may in self-protection

> utilize the educational process for inculcating those almost unconscious feelings which bind men together in a comprehending loyalty, whatever may be their lesser differences and difficulties. That is to say, the process may be utilized so long as men's right to believe as they please, to win others to their way of belief, and their right to assemble in their chosen places of worship for the devotional ceremonies of their faith, are fully respected.

But it was precisely the effort of the state "to coerce these children to express a sentiment which violates their deepest religious convictions" that led Justice Harlan Fisk Stone to dissent from the Court's decision. He came down on the side of the constitutional protections of religious liberty guaranteed by the First and Fourteenth Amendments:

> The Constitution may well elicit expressions of loyalty to it and to the government which is created, but it does not command such expressions or otherwise give any indication that compulsory expressions of loyalty play any such part in our scheme of government as to override the constitutional protection of freedom of speech and religion.

But Justice Stone also argued that the state and its schools have alternative ways to promote patriotism without coercing affirmation of belief, namely, by requiring all students to study history and civics:

> ....there are other ways to teach loyalty and patriotism which are the sources of national unity, than by compelling the pupil to affirm that which he

> does not believe and by commanding a form of affirmance which violates his religious convictions. Without recourse to such compulsion the state is free to compel attendance at school and require teaching by instruction and study of all in our history and in the structure and organization of our government, including the guarantees of civil liberty which tend to inspire patriotism and love of country.

For a short time, therefore, the compulsory flag salute and pledge of allegiance were permissible by Supreme Court ruling. When the children of Jehovah's Witnesses refused to participate, they were persecuted, called traitors, and often maltreated. In 1942 Congress prescribed the wording of the pledge accompanied by the right hand placed over the heart instead of the customary Nazi-like extended right arm. But when the state of West Virginia made the salute and pledge compulsory and scores of students were expelled for failing to comply, another case reached the Supreme Court, which reversed itself in the landmark decision of West Virginia v. Barnette.[17]

Justice Robert Jackson wrote the 6-3 opinion for the Court, in effect adopting the dissenting view in Gobitis of now-Chief Justice Stone:

> The issue here is whether this slow and easily neglected route to aroused loyalties [by the study of history and civics] constitutionally may be short-cut by substituting a compulsory salute and slogan...
>
> National unity as an end which officials may foster by persuasion and example is not in question. The

problem is whether under our Constitution compulsion as here employed is a permissible means for its achievement.

Justice Jackson in his ringing conclusion declared that compulsion was not permissible:

> If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein...
>
> We think the action of the local authorities in compelling the flag salute and pledge transcends constitutional limitations on their power and invades the sphere of intellect and spirit which it is the purpose of the First Amendment to our Constitution to reserve from all official control.

If George Bush had relied on Frankfurter's arguments in Gobitis and his long and eloquent dissent in Barnette, and if Michael Dukakis had marshaled Stone's dissent in Gobitis and Jackson's opinion in Barnette, the substance of the issue raised by the pledge of allegiance in 1988 might have been confronted as a matter of serious public discourse and decision, namely, what is the proper role of public schooling in promoting patriotism. As it was, neither candidate taught the public a useful civics lesson, and the electorate had not learned enough from their civic education in school or college to make informed judgments about the candidates.

It might even have helped to know that Harlan Fiske Stone was a Republican

appointed to the Court by Calvin Coolidge and raised to Chief Justice by Franklin D. Roosevelt. Or that the American Bar Association's Committee on the Bill of Rights had joined the American Civil Liberties Union in filing briefs of amicus curiae on behalf of Jehovah's Witnesses in both cases. The attempt to paint a simplistic contrast between liberal and conservative might have been tempered by history and civics lessons well taught and well learned in a revitalized civic education covering all twelve democratic values listed in this paper. A coherent, invigorated, substantive program of civic education throughout the school years is the best hope for the development of democratic civic character.

My argument is essentially that loyalty, patriotism, discipline, and duty should be defined in terms of the richest fulfillment of the total set of democratic values in the Twelve Tables of Civism. Fortunately, some liberal as well as conservative scholars are seeking to reformulate the role of education in developing a sense of civic obligation in the meaning of citizenship (see, for example, the list of selected readings, p. 42). The long-term test, however, will be whether American education can strengthen the sense of community and cohesion among succeeding generations through stress upon civic virtue and personal obligation for the public good without weakening the struggle for freedom, diversity, due process, and human rights. The closet door on patriotism may be opening a bit in the academic world and in the public press, but the task of reconstructing the idea of patriotism in citizenship is formidable, and the task of designing and carrying out appropriate educational programs dedicated to "civic consciousness'" or "civic intelligence," or "civic learning" is even more monumental.

Human Rights

Today, the obvious interdependence of the world requires that civic virtue or obligation for the public good should encompass a wider and more positive moral element than solely the need to defend the American public order when it is threatened from within our national boundaries or from without. It reminds us that the super-jingoistic patriotism, which in the past has been narrowly conceived as loyalty or obligation to one's own nation, must now be imbued with a broader international outlook that honors the world's diversity of peoples but also seeks a new and larger cohesion based upon the concepts of common human rights.

So I come, finally, to a value for American civic education that requires a basic change in our historical views and values of citizenship. The idea of national citizenship must now take account of the vast changes in the world situation that have occurred since the end of World War II. Increasingly popular terms to define the set of phenomena that began with the term "One World" in the 1940's are now "global interdependence," "global perspectives," or simply "global education."

I recognize that the term "global education" has been attacked by political and religious conservatives on the ground that it sees no superior values in the American way of life and thus preaches a kind of "moral relativism" or "moral neutrality." I believe that no one could understand the first eleven of my tables of civism and still think that I see no superior values in the ideals of American citizenship. But instead of global education, I advocate the term "international human rights" or simply "human rights" as a device to broaden civic education for Americans and yet not get overwhelmed by trying to cover all aspects of study of all the

world's peoples and cultures.

In fact, I come very close to the definition of global education in the report of the Study Commission on Global Perspectives in Education chaired by Clark Kerr, which outlines what students need to know to function as citizens of the United States in an increasingly interdependent world. The most extensive courses of study along these lines are contained in the two-year program in global studies required in grades 9 and 10 by the New York State Board of Regents for graduation from high school. The object of such study is partly to understand why it is that some nations and peoples have chosen a different way from that of the United States. But if the world is truly interdependent and if U.S. citizenship is genuinely devoted to democratic values, then global study should be searching for and preferring democratic answers to global issues as well as simply understanding the reasons for diverse views.[18]

The idea and practice of citizenship itself as conceived in various nations could be a major theme for this study. What does citizenship mean for Christians and Moslems in Lebanon, for blacks in South Africa, for Jews and dissidents in the Soviet Union, for ethnic and language groups in India, Sri Lanka, China, or Nigeria, and for new immigrants to the United States? A greater attention to human rights would give opportunities to address the positive aspects of democratic values and the obstacles or threats to such rights in various national approaches to citizenship. There is the danger of trying to do too much in too scattered and superficial fashion, as well as the danger of competition in the school curriculum between civic education, global education, and multicultural education. These three efforts to redirect the school curriculum are often carried on independently

of one another. There has been too little effort to interweave the three and too little recognition of their natural affinity. Indeed, they are often disparate, and sometimes even antagonistic, in their pressures on the schools.

Conclusion

The schools have an unparalleled opportunity to influence an entire generation of high school youth during the coming few years. The combination of the Constitution's Bicentennial, the appointment of one or more Supreme Court justices, and the elections of 1988 and 1992 could give unprecedented vitality to close study of basic constitutional issues and principles. Each school jurisdiction will decide for itself how to approach such an agenda in its curriculum, in its governance, and in its pervasive moral life.

But there is one innovative and national project readily at hand that promises to invigorate the civic life of those schools that take part. Between 1987 and 1991 the National Competition on the Constitution and Bill of Rights is being officially co-sponsored by the U.S. Bicentennial Commission and the Center for Civic Education. The competition is among school classes and groups of students rather than among individual students. It is being held in every congressional district and culminates in regional, state, and national awards. Classes prepare for the competition through the use of specially prepared study units on the historical ideas and political concepts underlying the Constitution's framing, adoption, and amendment, with special attention to the Bill of Rights and the changes in constitutional thought that followed ratification.

After completing their study, the classes compete as teams in

demonstrating their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles. Each class completes a qualifying multiple-choice test whose score will represent an average of the scores of all students in the whole class and then participates in a mock Congressional hearing on a series of selected fundamental constitutional issues. As judged by a panel of experts from the community, the combined score on the quality of their presentations at the hearing decides which class will continue in the competition. In both the test and the hearing, the entire class contributes to the preparation for the competition through individual study, group discussion, and other group activities in the school and in the community.

The competition could well motivate students and teachers alike to become much more aware of the need to clarify their own school's practices of authority and due process, freedom and diversity, equality and justice, patriotism and truth-telling as public goods. In the Washington finals in April, 1988, championship teams from 43 states not only took turns presenting their views orally on a series of important constitutional questions put to them by the judges, but they also engaged in a lively give-and-take by answering follow-up questions from the panel of experts.

These were no stilted classroom exercise learned by rote to be recited from memory from a boring textbook. These high school students, on the verge of becoming voting citizens, discussed key constitutional questions with knowledge, insight, and maturity. Some of the issues dealt with in these "hearings" included the justice of capital punishment, the consequences of civil disobedience, equality of opportunity, freedom of speech and religion or prayer in public schools, the separation of powers and checks and balances in matters of domestic and foreign policy from

Watergate to Nicaragua, judicial activism versus judicial restraint, and the role of due process in matters of life, liberty, and property. They not only know about Marbury v. Madison, but also about Brown v. Board of Education, Roe v. Wade, Engel v. Vitale, and on and on.

The size and success of this first year of a five-year project (involving 6,000 teachers and 500,000 students) have opened the door to a better civic education for all American youth. It behooves would-be "education presidents," "education governors," and "education legislators" to consider carefully what this and like projects could mean for the future of America. It is a long-term investment in the kind of educational reform that seeks to prepare oncoming generations for informed, responsible, and committed American citizenship.

Whichever political party wins in November, this long-term investment in civism is vital. To this end, a second major national effort is just getting under way to draw up and disseminate an exemplary curriculum framework for instruction in civic education at all levels in elementary and secondary schools. Funded for two years by the Pew Charitable Trusts, the project Civitas will be conducted by the Center for Civic Education and the Council for Advancement of Citizenship. The framework will (1) delineate the "fundamental civic principles and values of our constitutional republic," (2) formulate a defensible conception of citizenship embodying the best of our historical traditions but also looking to the future, and (3) indicate examples of democratic values that are especially appropriate for study at various age and grade levels.

Obviously, I applaud the purposes of project Civitas and wish it well. It could be a capstone for the educational reform movement of the 1980's.

To its goals I have dedicated both of my recent books. I close both books with the same words:

> As the United States embarks upon its third century, the role of education is fortunately regarded as a high priority in our national life. There are clamorous demands that education must sharpen the competitive edge of the United States in the world economy. Others argue that the schools should return to the safe harbors of traditional moral and religious values as embodied in the Judeo-Christian heritage and Western civilization. Still others call for piloting the schools through the uncharted shoals of moral choice by means of cultural literacy, intellectual excellence, or critical thinking. These views have their many persuasive advocates, but I believe there is a still more cogent priority.
>
> This book argues for revitalizing the historic civic mission of American education. This means explicit and continuing study of the basic concepts and values underlying our democratic political community and constitutional order. The common core of the curriculum throughout school and college years should be the morality of citizenship.[19]

We've heard from Paideia, Clio, Excellence, Competitiveness, "Content, Character, and Choice." Now, let's hear it for Civitas. Amy Gutmann concludes her penetrating analysis of democratic politics and education as follows:

> ..."political education" - the cultivation of the virtues, knowledge, and skills necessary for political participation - has moral primacy over other purposes of public education in a democratic society. Political education prepares citizens to participate in consciously reproducing their society, and conscious social reproduction is the ideal not only of democratic education but also of democratic politics...The most devastating criticism we can level at primary [and secondary] schools, therefore, is not that they fail to give equally talented children an equal chance to earn the same income or to pursue professional occupations, but that they fail to give all (educable) children an education adequate to take advantage of their political status as citizens.[20]

All I can add is a secular amen.

Notes

1. Social Studies Syllabus, 7th/8th Grades and 9th/10th Grades (Albany, N.Y.: New York State Department of Education, 1986); and History/Social Science Framework, K-12 (Sacramento, Calif.: California State Department of Education, 1987).
2. James D. Carroll, et. al., We the People: A Review of U.S. Government and Civics Textbooks (Washington, D.C.: People for the American Way, 1987), p. vi.
3. ibid., p. vii.
4. Report of the State of Maryland Values Education Commission (Baltimore, Md.: Maryland State Department of Education, January 31, 1983); Edward Wynne, "A List of Values," Character II (September/October 1986); Chester E. Finn, Jr., "Giving Shape to Cultural Conservatism," The American Spectator (November, 1986); and E.D. Hirsch, Jr., Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1987).
5. John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 302.
6. ibid., p. 61.
7. Michael Walzer, Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality (New York: Basic Books, 1983), p. 203.
8. John Higham, "Integration vs. Pluralism: Another American Dilemma," The Center Magazine, July/August 1974, pp. 72-73.
9. Michael Kammen, People of Paradox: An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), p. 85.

10. Leonard Krieger, "The Idea of Authority in the West," American Historical Review, April, 1977, pp. 249-270.

11. Richard Flathman, "Citizenship and Authority: A Chastened View of Citizenship," News for Teachers of Political Science, Summer, 1981, pp. 9-19; and J. Roland Pennock, "Rights and Citizenship," Ibid., Fall, 1981, pp. 12-23.

12. Amy Gutmann, Democratic Education, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987) see especially pages 3, 116-117, 125, and 287-288.

13. Kenneth M. Holland, "The Constitution and the Welfare State," This Constitution, Summer 1986, pp. 18-23. See also Charles A. Reich, "The New Property," The Yale Law Journal, April 1964, esp. pp. 771-774 and 778-786.

14. Stephen K. Bailey, The Purposes of Education (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976), pp. 84-94.

15. Benjamin R. Barber, Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); and Benjamin R. Barber, "Voting is Not Enough," Atlantic Monthly, June 1984, p. 52.

16. Minersville School District v. Gobitis, 310 U.S. 586 (1940).

17. West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

18. Study Commission on Global Education, The United States Prepares for Its Future: Global Perspectives in Education (New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1987).

19. R. Freeman Butts, The Morality of Democratic Citizenship: Goals for Civic Education in the Republic's Third Century (Calabasas, Calif.: Center for Civic Education, 1988), pp. 183-184.

Selected Readings

Recent Scholarly Books on Democratic Values and Citizenship

Barber, Benjamin R., Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

Bellah, Robert N., et. al., Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life (New York: Harper and Row, 1985).

Gutmann, Amy, Democratic Education (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987).

Gutmann, Amy and Dennis C. Thompson, eds., Ethics and Politics: Cases and Comments (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1984).

Janowitz, Morris, The Reconstruction of Patriotism: Education for Civic Consciousness (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

Kammen, Michael, The Machine That Would Go of Itself: The Constitution in American Culture (New York: Knopf, 1986).

Ketcham, Ralph, Individualism and Public Life (New York: Blackwell, 1987).

Moskos, Charles E., A Call to Civic Service: National Service for Country and Community (New York: Free Press, 1988).

Pratt, Richard, The Civic Imperative: Examining the Need for Civic Education (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

Sandel, Michael J., Liberalism and the Limits of Justice, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Smith, Rogers M., Liberalism and American Constitutional Law (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985).

Thompson, Dennis C., Political Ethics and Public Office, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987).

Walzer, Michael, Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality (New York: Basic Books, 1983).